

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are canceled. Claims 11-20 are pending. Claims 11, 18 and 20 are amended.

Claim Objections

Claim 18 is objected to because of a grammatical error. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended Claim 13 to remove the several "such as" phrases and further clarify the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Price (US 6,076,036).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 11 to include a limitation that the method includes maintaining the vehicle speed at the uniform vehicle speed when a difference between the actual vehicle speed and the uniform vehicle speed is less than a predetermined speed difference. Stated differently, if the vehicle speed error is less than the predetermined speed difference then the method does *not* attempt to correct the vehicle speed.

As best understood, Price does not describe such a feature and therefore does not anticipate Claim 11.

Claims 12-13 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 11 and are therefore

believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 11.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price, as applied to Claim 11-13 above, and further in view of Moncelle (US 4,914,597).

Applicant respectfully submits that cited combination does not provide the limitations that have been amended into Claim 11 and therefore no longer provides a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant therefore believes that Claims 14-19 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 11.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Price and Moncelle, as applied to Claims 14-19 above, and further in view of Lanyi (US 6,485,341).

Applicant respectfully submits that cited combination does not provide the limitations that have been amended into Claim 11 and therefore no longer provides a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant therefore believes that Claim 20 is in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and rejections and are in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants